

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4 and 6-22 were previously pending in the application.

Claims 8-12 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7 and 13-22 are rejected.

Claims 1, 3-4 and 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7 and 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7 and 13-22 remain in the case for consideration.

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-4 and 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0168725 to Warner, et al (“Warner”).

Claims 1-4 and 13-22 are rejected for the same reason as set forth in the previous Office Action dated April 4, 2005.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants thank the Examiner’s confirmation, in an official action dated October 14, 2005, that applicants’ invention *is* prior to the October 28, 2002 filing date of Warner. However, the Examiner alleges that Warner’s Patent Application Publication US 2003/0168725 is a continuation-in-part of US Patent No. 6,225,688 filed on Feb. 4, 1999 and of US Patent No. 6,121,676 filed on Dec. 11, 1997 and goes on to say that these dates precede the dates of supporting documents attested to prior conception of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that features of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0168725, e.g., FIG. 4, relied on by the Examiner to reject the claimed invention are *not* shown or disclosed in either of the U.S. Patent No. 6,121,676 (“’676 patent”) or U.S. Patent. No. 6,255,688 (“’688 patent”), i.e., new matter to these patents. For example, among other things, nowhere does ‘676 patent or ‘688 patent teach or disclose, among other things, “a first molding resin covering the top surface of the first substrate portion and the first integrated circuit chip.” See the element 25 of FIG. 2 of the present application and the molding resin 226 of FIG. 4 of Warner.

Accordingly, the above dates cannot be used to precede the dates of supporting documents presented by applicants as the features of Warner are not supported by the ‘676

patent or '688 patent. Thus, Warner is not a prior art to the present application and, therefore, claims 1-4, 6-7 and 13-22 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Warren.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0168725 to Warner, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,576,493 to Lin, et al.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected for the same reason as set forth in the previous Office Action dated April 4, 2005.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As discussed above, Warner is not a prior art to the present application. Therefore, the rejection under Section 103(a) is moot.

In conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3-4, 6-7 and 13-22 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Hosoon Lee
Reg. No. 56,737

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office via facsimile number
(571) 273-8300 on December 12, 2005.


Li Mei Vermilya